US 50 HOV Lanes Plus Community Enhancements
Environmental Document
Corridor Advisory Committee

Final Report - Introduction

Purpose of the Project

In January 2003, Caltrans District 3 convened a Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) to advise Caltrans during the developmental stages of the Environmental Document for the US 50 HOV Lanes Plus Community Enhancements project from downtown Sacramento to Sunrise Blvd. The Environmental Document is being developed as a partnership between Caltrans, the City of Sacramento, the County of Sacramento and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). Input from the CAC will be used to inform and guide the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Steering Committee consisting of staff from Caltrans, the City of Sacramento, the County of Sacramento, SACOG, Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA), and Regional Transit (RT) on issues related to the scope of the environmental document for the HOV lanes and off system improvements along US 50 between downtown Sacramento and Sunrise Boulevard.

Composition of the Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC)

In the fall of 2002, Caltrans conducted outreach to notify the community of the CAC's formation and to encourage people who live, work or commute along the corridor, or who represent organizations with an interest in the corridor, to apply to serve on the CAC. Those who were interested in participating on the CAC submitted formal applications along with letters of support from the organizations they were representing. CAC members were selected based on their ability to represent and communicate with a cross-section of local organizations, businesses, local governmental agencies and neighborhoods likely to be affected by the project along the US 50 corridor from downtown Sacramento to Sunrise Boulevard. The elected officials on the STA Board who represent jurisdictions on the corridor reviewed the proposed CAC membership. Upon the recommendation of the STA Board Members, Caltrans recruited representatives of additional organizations/communities to join the CAC. The following is a list of CAC members who have participated in the process and the organizations that they represent:

1. Fernando Alexander, Butterfield/Rivera East Community Association
2. Joe Barwick, Verizon Wireless, Folsom
3. Jim Behrmann, Walk Sacramento
4. Heath Charamuga, Rosemont Community Association
5. Jerry Clark, Marina Neighborhood - El Dorado Hills
6. Peter Cooey, Winn Park/Capital Avenue Neighborhood Association
7. Warren Cushman, Californians for Disability Rights, Inc.
8. Jeff Douglas, Franchise Tax Board, Rancho Cordova
9. Shawn Eldredge, Winn Park/Capital Avenue Neighborhood Association
10. Nancy Finch, Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)
11. Marie Henry, Sacramento Municipal Utilities District Employee
12. Terry Johnson, Oak Park Business Association
13. Roger Levy, “No Way LA” Coalition
14. Richard Marshall, Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3
15. Jan Perez, Tower District Alliance/Land Park Community Association
16. Walt Seifert, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates
17. Art Smith, Rivera East and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
18. Dan Weitzman, Tahoe Park Neighborhood Association

CAC Process
The CAC met a total of nine times, starting in January 2003 and ending in October 2003 (there was no meeting in April). The first three CAC meetings were orientation in nature, dealing with organization, background and HOV lanes in general. In meetings 4 and 5 (and in a homework assignment with disposable cameras), the CAC identified issues and opportunities along the US 50 corridor between downtown Sacramento and Sunrise Blvd. Beginning in meeting 6 and continuing through meeting 9, the CAC reviewed and discussed the project alternatives being looked at by the Technical Advisory Committee (including the no build alternative). The CAC offered feedback and comments on the pros and cons of each alternative, made recommendations for potential community enhancements, and identified additional alternatives to be considered in the environmental document.

Major Findings
The major findings of the CAC are summarized in the attached matrices, which outline general comments, as well as pros and cons of the different alternatives and ideas for community enhancements. This information will be very useful in the development of the environmental document. It should be noted that comments and input contained in the final report and supporting materials represent individual CAC comments or suggestions and do not represent the consensus of the group.

Differences of Opinion
Given the composition of the CAC, including the intentional diversity of opinion represented, project sponsors never intended nor expected that CAC members would be able to reach consensus or make recommendations on behalf of the entire CAC. Each individual CAC member has provided a valuable perspective on the project. Individual CAC input has been taken as advisory and individual differences of opinion have been captured and summarized in the final report and supporting materials.

Attachments
Attached to this Final Report are a CAC evaluation summary, the project Charter, quarterly reports, meeting minutes (with photoreductions of the wallgraphics), and other CAC work products.

Next Steps
The next steps will be to start the environmental process for the US 50 HOV lanes plus community enhancements environmental document. There will be a series of community meetings up and down the corridor between downtown Sacramento and Sunrise Blvd. as part of the environmental process to allow local residents and businesses opportunities to review and comment on the proposed project.

For More Information
For more information about this project or the material contained in this report, please contact Donna Berry, Project Manager, Caltrans District 3, by phone at (916) 274-0658, or via email at dberry@dot.ca.gov.

Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC)

Please note: The following is a summary of the pros, cons and community enhancements identified by the CAC for each of the alternatives, including the no build alternative. Comments that apply to all of the alternatives are shown in the "General Comments" section. Additional alternatives for the TAC to consider are listed at the end of this report. All of the comments shown represent individual CAC member's suggestions and not the consensus of the group.

Alternative	Pros	Cons	Community Enhancements
General Comments	▪ Job growth in the region – will need to implement all circulation improvements that promote traffic movement, both into and out of the downtown. ▪ Air quality would be improved. ▪ Will encourage use of carpools. ▪ HOV lanes can complement other alternative forms of transportation. ▪ Timing of HOV construction should complement other alternatives. ▪ Pros depend on how you define success. ▪ Roadway plans respond to current development pressures, growth, and problems. ▪ HOV lane doesn't mean most of the traffic is going into downtown – people are also passing through to points further west and east. <u>Other comments:</u> ▪ EIR needs to clearly define study area and scope. ▪ Are there studies that support / refute that HOV lanes promote carpooling and alternative modes? ▪ Have workshop on pros/cons of HOV lanes. ▪ Provide adequate enforcement for HOV lanes. ▪ Clean up the merge lane between Highway 50 and Route 80.	▪ Air quality is affected by traffic loads (Express Bus or BRT better?) ▪ Data not conclusive to support/refute HOV air quality benefits. ▪ Need to look at safety impacts and who is at more risk, commuters or residents? ▪ With or without HOV, downtown traffic is unsafe for pedestrians and bikes. ▪ El Dorado residents don't use HOV/carpools; prefer other transit modes; want freedom to travel! El Dorado transit is picking up users. ▪ No evidence that HOV lanes result in new carpool formation when freeways are operating at less than capacity. ▪ No evidence of air pollution benefits. ▪ Increased freeway capacity likely to induce more vehicle trips. ▪ Increased freeway capacity will create sprawl and encourage long distance commutes resulting in air pollution impacts, increased energy usage, increased oil dependence, increased surface street congestion, increased vehicle crash injuries and fatalities, loss of open space, loss of permeable surface area, reduced levels of physical activity, harm to public health and increased police and emergency services costs. ▪ Undermines investment in parallel light rail system. ▪ Spending on automobile-oriented transportation represents a poor choice because it makes it more difficult to develop a balanced transportation system. ▪ Freeways divide communities. ▪ Lack of maintenance – disheveled conditions. ▪ Light rail tracks at HOV exits will create conflicts in downtown.	1. Supply laptop hook-ups on transit vehicles. 2. Make BRT/Express Bus and vanpool more attractive than the car – provide an exclusive transit lane. 3. Plan for BRT/Express Bus lanes that can be changed to accommodate future changes such as rapid transit, etc. Assume future changes will occur and set aside the easements now. 4. Provide carpool lots that are lit, secure, nice looking, under the freeway, and near transit pick-up. 5. Provide signal detection and timings for pedestrians and bikes - important for all alternatives. 6. Provide more Park & Ride lots further east. 7. Repair sidewalks (many are torn-up!). 8. Add metering at exits and entries (make it consistent throughout the system). 9. Provide bike/pedestrian overcrossings - See overcrossing at Aerojet for positive bike/pedestrian example. 10. Install audible signals for the blind at intersections and bots dots at intersections (currently done by local jurisdictions – by request). 11. Consider an alternative with a drop ramp in West Sacramento. (Tie in to pedestrian bridge over the river to West Sac.) 12. Promote transit through more advertisements to commuters: "Get off Highway 50 early and take rapid transit to downtown sites." 13. Put up electronic signs with the estimated arrival times of light rail (time to downtown in car: x minutes; time to downtown on light rail: y minutes). 14. Make light rail visible to highway traffic. 15. Provide for easy exit off the freeway and access to light rail all along the corridor. 16. Work with City and developers to tie HOV lanes into transit options at the railyard (HOV to enhance traffic delivery). 17. Provide more park and ride and transit stops to take people to sites along the corridor. 18. Contribute to user delivery to downtown venues through densification and infill development. 19. Highlight lots of opportunities along the corridor to exit and pick up transit. 20. Provide drop ramps at transit stops. 21. Increase parking costs and enforcement in downtown. 22. Coordinate current traffic construction (i.e. Watt Avenue improvements and access to light rail) with longer-term enhancements and connections and make them work together. 23. If there is any downtown HOV off-ramp, then traffic has to be "stopped" at the off-ramp (dropped into a parking lot). ▪ Supply transit pick-ups – BRT, bus stops. ▪ Prevent HOV traffic from entering downtown. 24. Terminate leases of under-freeway "air space" for storage units, and put more valuable uses/resources in air space. 25. Provide additional bike/pedestrian crossings – at reasonable frequencies (Zinfandel, etc.). 26. Provide non-interchange freeway crossings--bike/pedestrian only or for all modes, at a neighborhood scale such as 48th Street and 51st Street over Hwy 50. 27. Provide interchange improvements to make them more bike/pedestrian safe and accessible. 28. Provide signal detection and timing for cyclists and pedestrians.

Alternative	Pros	Cons	Community Enhancements
General Comments *(continued)*			29. Provide bicycle boulevard(s) (like in Berkeley, Palo Alto and Vancouver) to help compensate for increased traffic on surface streets. 30. Do additional reversion of one-way streets to two-way streets in downtown. 31. Provide improved bicycle access and parking at light rail stations. 32. Provide improved enforcement for the increased traffic in the downtown/midtown areas through technology based systems such as red light cameras or additional funding for traffic officers. 33. Do grade separation of light rail tracks. 34. Create a parking structure and light rail station over/under Hwy 50 at HOV offramps for transfer of motorists to light rail for last leg of journey. Include a light rail pass with parking charge. 35. Add protective lanes signage at off ramps to freeways (Folsom, Watt and Mather are examples of where it's needed). 36. Provide visual cues to drivers as they enter/merge onto highway (Florida has green lights). 37. Add signage over HOV lanes to notify the driver of distance to next exit ramp. 38. Provide for sound wall continuity throughout the entire system. 39. Add trees and planter areas (roses, pyracantha) to screen sound walls. 40. Use trees, landscaping and sound walls to buffer neighborhoods from freeway. 41. Provide planted medians on surface streets near freeway exits and entries. 42. Create gateway signage. 43. Provide bike/pedestrian access over freeway. 44. Provide more bike trails throughout corridor and link bike trails to one another. 45. Get bike/pedestrians out of intersections through dedicated pathways away from traffic and signals and overpasses rather than crosswalks and signals (separated crossings). 46. Link existing bike trails to each other and to overcrossings (new and proposed). Existing bike trails are disconnected (i.e. American River bike trail does not connect to other bike routes). 47. Coordinate with other jurisdictions (including City, County, STA, State Parks, Caltrans) to improve bike paths and trails – this is a regional issue. 48. Give more weight to alternative modes of transportation (bike, pedestrian, etc.). There should be a minimum of 51% given to alternative modes. 49. Allow for informal rider pick-up/carpool system. 50. Utilize "air space" for appropriate uses including retail, parking and transit pick-up sites. 51. Add cultural motifs to the freeway system that reflects local history and events. 52. Include community enhancements that were presented in Darold Heiken's presentation – building an individual community identity based on local history, culture. 53. Require developers to pay into a mitigation fund that addresses congestion/traffic issue/alternatives. 54. Locate HOV lanes so not to conflict with light rail lanes. 55. Address development pressures first. Land use development affects traffic, roads and transportation systems. Roads and transportation systems are always lagging behind development. Why do patching of transportation system? 56. Encourage/require Regional Transit to comment on development proposals. 57. Continue to coordinate with other studies and plans from other jurisdictions (i.e., SWAT plan, 65th Street, Howe, BRT, etc.).

Alternative	Pros	Cons	Community Enhancements
5B EB direct on ramp from 10th St. WB direct off ramp to 16th St.	▪ Takes HOV lanes furthest west than other alternatives.	▪ Losing a lane downtown is not good. ▪ Elevated ramps are not wanted! ▪ Visual impacts. ▪ Noise impacts. ▪ Property values are impacted with elevated ramps and lanes. ▪ 16th Street ramp drops all traffic into downtown. ▪ 10th Street on ramp - employees won't use it unless forced back on. ▪ 10th St. Buddhist temple and pedestrians. ▪ 'East End Project' – no parking available – use light rail as designed by State. ▪ If not using 10th St., then more "weaving" occurs. ▪ P&T Streets – very difficult to cross – don't add to traffic load. ▪ Does not address east end traffic – east and west entry and exit ramps are several blocks away. ▪ 15th and 16th Streets are already very dangerous with out more cars. ▪ Impacts to pedestrians and bikes. ▪ Do not put additional ramps here. ▪ Center for the Blind is near 16th (use 16th St. lot). ▪ Large elderly population in the southwest quadrant of downtown in and around 10th street, including a significant Asian population, many of whom are elderly and do not speak English. If a ramp is put near 10th Street, it will increase the amount of cars in this area which may lead to an increase in traffic related deaths of elderly Asian people who live in the neighborhood.	▪ Take HOV lanes further west than the 5B alternative. ▪ If a ramp is put at 10th Street, Caltrans needs to go beyond the measures it has used in the past to protect pedestrian safety in and around freeways. There needs to be more signals and longer signal time for pedestrians to cross streets.

Alternative	Pros	Cons	Community Enhancements
6B EB direct on ramp from 10th St. WB direct off ramp to 21st St.	▪ Less elevated than 5B. ▪ Costs less. ▪ Question: Can Riverside be lowered to reduce "whaleback"?	▪ East end HOV options. ▪ Choke point – loss of lanes. ▪ See 16th St. comments [for 5B] and apply to 21st St. ▪ Increased distance between on and off ramps. ▪ See comments from 5B re: elderly population near 10th Street. ▪ New drops onto W Street.	▪ Can speed bumps be used downtown? (Slow traffic as they exit HOV/freeway.) ▪ Consider red light cameras at intersections. ▪ Need big transition "statement" to slow people down when exiting ramps. ▪ 16th Street is very difficult for pedestrians, also 21st Street (though less onerous than 16th). ▪ See comments from 5B re: elderly population – give more signal time to cross at intersections.
7B EB direct on ramp from 21st St. WB direct off ramp to Riverside Blvd.	▪ Relieves traffic on 16th and 21st. ▪ Makes better exit than 16th. ▪ Riverside better than 10th? ▪ HOV users don't have to weave to existing off ramps. ▪ Stop signs on 11th encourage 10th St. use. ▪ One-way into downtown makes sense.	▪ 11th Street/Riverside has a bike lane (north and south of W St.) ▪ Long queue at ramp? ▪ Is 21st St. ramp needed with ramp at 11th St.? ▪ On-ramps at 10th are circuitous. ▪ Long queues at Riverside signal. ▪ Already a mess from 16th St./10th St./I-5 weaves. ▪ Not want 10th St. to become another one-way "highway."	▪ Need signaling at ramp at Riverside for bikes. ▪ Direct traffic coming off freeway into a parking structure or use surface parking at 5th St. (under the freeway) – needs to be used 24/7. ▪ Need better signage and access to parking to entice parkers – make it easy! ▪ Need trees, curb extensions, etc. to make 10th St. look less like a "highway" and to slow traffic.

Alternative	Pros	Cons	Community Enhancements
10D No HOV direct on/off ramps. HOV lanes begin/end at 9th St.	▪ No additional off ramps. ▪ Makes it easy to expand or extend future HOV lanes further west. ▪ Provides additional mixed-flow lanes for off-hour use. ▪ Possible future connection to I-5 deck (needed for new downtown venues). ▪ Users may leave the HOV lanes early. ▪ Sets up possibility for Express Bus/HOT lane designation.	▪ Makes weave worse (from large buses, etc., exiting the HOV lanes).	▪ Is there a way to force users to exit the HOV lanes early (in enough time to exit safely), such as with early exit signs for HOV?
Minimum Project Sunrise to 27th Street.	▪ Does not impact any new areas in downtown.	▪ Lots of traffic on X Street and 26th Street exits and entry. ▪ Doesn't solve downtown issues. ▪ Comment: Consider ending the HOV lane at 65th Street or Stockton Blvd (before Highway 99 weave).	

Alternative	Pros	Cons	Community Enhancements
No Build	▪ Least sprawl inducing. ▪ Least impact on downtown by encouraging people to take light rail or transit. ▪ Most encouraging of use of alternative modes.	▪ Doesn't address additional 50,000 workers projected for downtown. ▪ Doesn't address congestion reality. ▪ Doesn't address increased gridlock all along the corridor (particularly at Bradshaw, Watt and Mather). ▪ Possibility of increased accidents on freeway because of stop and go. ▪ Doesn't address impacts of CSUS growth on the corridor. ▪ Light rail alone won't accommodate the need (1 million people future growth). ▪ Need all possible transit and transportation options; this alternative eliminates the HOV option. ▪ Encourages sprawl due to congestion. ▪ Lack of construction dollars downtown from no HOV lanes being built.	▪ Make 15th, 16th and 21st Streets safer. ▪ Close the 16th Street off ramp. ▪ Widen Folsom Blvd. under the railroad tracks (2-3 places).

Other Alternatives for the TAC to consider:

- BRT (Bus Rapid Transit)
- HOT (High Occupancy Toll) Lanes
- Transit-only HOV lanes
- Take-a-lane HOV lanes (convert existing mixed flow lane to HOV lane)
- Express Bus
- Demand reduction (reduce demand through combination of parking costs, road tolls, increased fuel taxes, enhanced alternatives)
- HOV lanes that are exclusively for HOV use at all hours of the day and require 3 passengers